arXiv:1407.1453v1 [q-fin.MF] 6 Jul 2014

Non-arbitrage for Informational Discrete Time Market Models

Tahir Choulli * and Jun Deng †

July 8, 2014

Abstract

This paper focuses on the stability of the non-arbitrage condition in discrete time market models when some unknown information τ is partially/fully incorporated into the market. Our main conclusions are twofold. On the one hand, for a fixed market S, we prove that the non-arbitrage condition is preserved under a mild condition. On the other hand, we give the necessary and sufficient equivalent conditions on the unknown information τ to ensure the validity of the non-arbitrage condition for any market. Two concrete examples are presented to illustrate the importance of these conditions, where we calculate explicitly the arbitrage opportunities when they exist.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we pertain our attention to discrete time market models, where we consider a real-valued stochastic process $S = (S_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ that is indexed by the finite discrete time $\{0, 1, ..., N\}$. The process S usually represents the risky assets.

First, let us specify the definitions and notations. We suppose given a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}, \mathbb{P})$ and the process $S = (S_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ is adapted to the filtration $\mathbb{F}$. We say a process X satisfies the non-arbitrage condition under the filtration $\mathbb{H} := (\mathcal{H}_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ (hereafter, NA($\mathbb{H}$)) if

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for any predictable process } H := (H_n)_{0\leq n\leq N},\ (i.e.\ H_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1}) \text{ such that} \\ &\sum_{1\leq n\leq N} H_n\Delta X_n \geq 0,\ \text{we have } \sum_{1\leq n\leq N} H_n\Delta X_n \equiv 0,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

The process H can be interpreted as the trading strategies that one holds dynamically through time. Loosely speaking, the non-arbitrage condition means there is no possibility that one can make profit out of nothing. The equivalence between the non-arbitrage condition and equivalent martingale measure is essentially due to the work of Dalang, Morton and Willinger [6], see also different approaches Schachermayer [13] and Rogers [12].

Theorem 1.1 (Dalang-Morton-Willinger)**.** *The process X satisfies the non-arbitrage condition if and only there exists an equivalent martingale measure. In this case, the equivalent martingale measure $\mathbb{Q}$ can be chosen with uniformly bounded density $d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P}$.*

It was baptized as The Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing. In this paper, we consider two economic agents with different information levels, one with the public available information $\mathbb{F}$ and an

*corresponding to: tchoulli@ualberta.ca, Mathematical and Statistical Sciences Depart., University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

†School of Banking and Finance, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China

insider with some extra information beside $\mathbb{F}$. Our goal is to study whether the insider with the extra information (characterized as a random time τ in what follows) could make arbitrages. The extra information τ could be the occurrence time of a default event, the knowledge that only insiders could get, and the last passage time of a process, etc. For continuous time settings, we refer to the recent works of Aksamit et al. [1], Acciaio et al. [3], Choulli et al. [5], Coculescu et al. [7], Fontana et al. [9] and Song [14].

We begin with two examples that illustrate how the interplay of the random time τ and the market S could affect the non-arbitrage condition.

Example 1.2. *On the stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_n)_{0\leq n\leq 2}, \mathbb{P})$, we consider a two period discrete model $S := (S_n)_{0\leq n\leq 2}$, where $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}$ represents the uncertainties and the natural filtration $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_n)_{0\leq n\leq 2}$ is given by*

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\},\ \mathcal{F}_1 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}\}, \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_2 = \sigma(\{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1\}, \{\omega_2\}, \{\omega_3\}, \{\omega_4\}\}).$$

Let u and d be two constants such that $u > 1$ and $0 < d < 1$. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}) &= uS_0,\quad S_1(\{\omega_3, \omega_4\}) = dS_0, \\ S_2(\{\omega_1\}) &= u^2S_0,\ S_2(\{\omega_2\}) = udS_0,\ S_2(\{\omega_3\}) = udS_0, S_2(\{\omega_4\}) = d^2S_0. \end{aligned}$$

The probability that the stock price will increase (or decrease) is p (or $q = 1 - p$). We assume that the risk-free interest rate is zero and $pu + (1-p)d = 1$, i.e. S is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale under the physical probability

$$\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}(\omega_1), \mathbb{P}(\omega_2), \mathbb{P}(\omega_3), \mathbb{P}(\omega_4)) = (p^2, pq, pq, q^2).$$

The evolution of the stock price S through time is illustrated as



Consider the random time

$$\tau = \begin{cases} 1, & on\ \ \{\omega_3\} \\ 2, & otherwise. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Apparently, τ is not an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time since $\{\tau = 1\} \notin \mathcal{F}_1$. A straightforward calculation shows the stopped market $S^\tau := (S_{n\wedge\tau})_{0\leq n\leq 2}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_0^\tau &= S_0,\quad S_1^\tau(\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}) = uS_0,\quad S_1^\tau(\{\omega_3, \omega_4\}) = dS_0, \\ S_2^\tau(\{\omega_1\}) &= u^2S_0,\ S_2^\tau(\{\omega_2\}) = udS_0,\ S_2^\tau(\{\omega_3\}) = dS_0, S_2^\tau(\{\omega_4\}) = d^2S_0. \end{aligned}$$

The evolution of the stock price S^τ through time is illustrated as



Then, one could easily show that there exist arbitrage opportunities in the market S^τ. Indeed, a short selling on the scenarioes $\{\omega_3, \omega_4\}$ at time 1 would generate a sure profit.

Example 1.3. *We assume the same settings as Example 1.2 and suppose that*

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\{\omega_1,\omega_2\}) &= uS_0, \quad S_1(\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}) = dS_0, \\ S_2(\{\omega_1\}) &= u^2S_0, \ S_2(\{\omega_2\}) = udS_0, \ S_2(\{\omega_3\}) = udS_0, S_2(\{\omega_4\}) = dS_0. \end{aligned}$$

Set the physical probability $\mathbb{P}$ as

$$\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}(\omega_1), \mathbb{P}(\omega_2), \mathbb{P}(\omega_3), \mathbb{P}(\omega_4)) = \left(\frac{(1-d)^2}{(u-d)^2}, \frac{(u-1)(1-d)}{(u-d)^2}, \lambda\frac{u-1}{u-d}, (1-\lambda)\frac{u-1}{u-d} \right),$$

where $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then, it is easy to see that S is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale under $\mathbb{P}$ and is given by



Consider the random time

$$\tau_1 = \begin{cases} 1, & on \ \{\omega_3\} \\ 2, & otherwise. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

One can easily show that $S^{\tau_1} = S$ since τ_1 has no impact on S on the scenarios $\{\omega_3, \omega_4\}$. Therefore, there is no arbitrage opportunity in S^{τ_1}.

Motivated by these two examples, we are intending to find the necessary and sufficient conditions on τ or/and S such that the market S^τ or $S - S^\tau$ still satisfies the non-arbitrage condition. We will come back to these two examples in the last section to explore why the non-arbitrage condition fails in Example 1.2 and holds in Example 1.3.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 recalls some notations and definitions related to random time and progressive enlargement of filtration. In Section 3, we prove that the non-arbitrage condition is preserved for a fixed $\mathbb{F}$-martingale S under some mild equivalent conditions on the stochastic interval $[\![0, \tau]\!]$; while in Section 4 we aim at the non-arbitrage condition on the stochastic interval $]\!]\tau, +\infty[\![$. In the last section, we present two examples to illustrate the importance of the conditions in Section 3 and 4. Furthermore, we construct explicitly the arbitrage opportunities when they exist.

2 Preliminary

On a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_n)_{0\le n\le N}, \mathbb{P})$, we assume given an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process $S = (S_n)_{0\le n\le N}$ that represents the risky asset price and one risky-free asset that is assumed to be constant 1. In the market, we consider two economic agents, one with the public information $\mathbb{F}$ and an insider with the extra information τ and $\mathbb{F}$. These constitute the public information market $(\mathbb{F}, S)$ and the insider information market $(\mathbb{F}, S, \tau)$.

We start by recalling some notations and definitions related to the random time $\tau : \Omega \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ that would be fixed throughout this paper. For any random time τ, we associate the following two Azéma supermartingales

$$Z_n := P[\tau > n|\mathcal{F}_n] \text{ and } \widetilde{Z}_n := P[\tau \ge n|\mathcal{F}_n], \tag{2.4}$$

and the $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times

$$R_1 := \inf\{n \ge 0 : Z_n = 0\}, \quad R_2 := \inf\{n \ge 1 : Z_{n-1} = 0\} \text{ and } R_3 := \inf\{n \ge 0 : \widetilde{Z}_n = 0\}. \tag{2.5}$$

To incorporate the information from the random time τ, we enlarge the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ by $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_n)_{0\le n\le N}$

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \mathcal{F}_n \vee \sigma(\tau \le n). \tag{2.6}$$

In the literature, $\mathbb{G}$ is called the progressive enlargement filtration that is the smallest one that contains $\mathbb{F}$ and makes τ a stopping time. The insider information market is precisely characterized by $(\mathbb{G}, S, \tau)$.

Lemma 2.1. *For any random time τ and the stopping times in (2.5), the following hold.*
(a) *For all n, $\{Z_{n-1} = 0\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} \subset \{Z_n = 0\}$.*
(b) *$R_1 \le R_3 \le R_2 = R_1 + 1$.*
(c) *On $\{n \le \tau\}$, Z_{n-1} and $\widetilde{Z}_n$ are both positive. Consequently, $\tau \le R_1$.*

Proof. (a) Notice that

$$E\left[\widetilde{Z}_n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right] = E\left[Z_{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right] = 0.$$

Hence, $\{Z_{n-1} = 0\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\}$. Due to $Z_n \le \widetilde{Z}_n$, we have $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} \subset \{Z_n = 0\}$.

(b) We observe that $\{R_2 = n\} = \{Z_{n-1} = 0\} \cap \left(\bigcup_{0\le i\le n-2}\{Z_i > 0\}\right) = \{R_1 = n-1\}$. Therefore $R_2 = R_1 + 1$ and is a predictable stopping time. The inequality $R_1 \le R_3$ follows immediately from (a).

(c) Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\ \mathbb{I}_{\{n\le\tau\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right] &= E\left[Z_{n-1}\mathbb{I}_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right] = 0, \text{ and} \\ E\left[\ \mathbb{I}_{\{n\le\tau\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}\right] &= E\left[\widetilde{Z}_n\mathbb{I}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}\right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Z_{n-1} and $\widetilde{Z}_n$ are strictly positive on the set $\{n \le \tau\}$ and $\tau \le R_1$. □

Remark 2.2. *It was proved in Dellacherie and Meyer [8] these three sets $\{Z_- = 0\}$, $\{Z = 0\}$ and $\widetilde{Z} = 0$ have the same début in continuous time setting that discrete time does not share.*

Lemma 2.3. *The Azéma supermartingale $(Z_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ has the following decomposition.*

$$Z_n = m_n - A_n, \quad m_n := P[\tau > n|\mathcal{F}_n] + \sum_{0\leq k\leq n} P[\tau = k|\mathcal{F}_k], \ A_n := \sum_{0\leq k\leq n} P[\tau = k|\mathcal{F}_k], \tag{2.7}$$

where $(m_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale and $(A_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted increasing process.

Proof. It is enough to prove $(m_n)_{0\leq n\leq N}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale. To this end, we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[m_{n+1}\Big|\mathcal{F}_n\Big] &= P\Big[\tau > n+1\Big|\mathcal{F}_n\Big] + \sum_{0\leq k\leq n+1} E\Big[P[\tau = k|\mathcal{F}_k]\Big|\mathcal{F}_n\Big] \\ &= P\Big[\tau > n+1\Big|\mathcal{F}_n\Big] + \sum_{0\leq k\leq n} P\Big[\tau = k|\mathcal{F}_k\Big] + P\Big[\tau = n+1\Big|\mathcal{F}_n\Big] \\ &= P[\tau > n|\mathcal{F}_n] + \sum_{0\leq k\leq n} P[\tau = k|\mathcal{F}_k] = m_n. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of the lemma. □

Remark 2.4. *In general, the decomposition $Z = m - A$ is not the Doob-Meyer decomposition.*

The following lemma describes the connection between conditional expectations under $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{G}$. For its proof, we consult Jeulin [10].

Lemma 2.5. *Let Y be an integrable and $\mathbb{A}$-measurable random variable. Then, the following hold.*
(a) *On the set $\{n < \tau\}$, the conditional expectation of Y under $\mathcal{G}_n$ is given by*

$$E[Y|\mathcal{G}_n]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau>n\}} = E\left[Y\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau>n\}}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\frac{1}{Z_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau>n\}}. \tag{2.8}$$

(b) *On the set $\{n \leq \tau\}$, the conditional expectation of Y under $\mathcal{G}_{n-1}$ is given by*

$$E[Y|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq n\}} = E\left[Y\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq n\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\frac{1}{Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq n\}}. \tag{2.9}$$

Moreover, if Y is $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable, we have

$$E[Y|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq n\}} = E\left[Y\widetilde{Z}_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\frac{1}{Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq n\}}. \tag{2.10}$$

3 Non-arbitrage on $[\![0,\tau]\!]$

In this section, we will prove that the non-arbitrage condition is preserved under one mild condition when the market is stopped at random horizon τ. Furthermore, we gave the necessary and sufficient conditions (on τ or the stopping times in (2.5)) to guarantee the stability of the non-arbitrage condition for any market S^τ.

The following theorem characterizes the relationship between $\mathbb{F}$-martingales and $\mathbb{G}$-martingales. For the continuous time settings, we consult Jeulin [10].

Theorem 3.1. *Let M be an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale and τ be a random time. Then the following process*

$$\widehat{M}_n^{(b)} := M_{n\wedge\tau} - \sum_{1\leq k\leq n}\frac{1}{Z_{k-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}}E\left[\Delta M_k\widetilde{Z}_k|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right], \tag{3.11}$$

is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale.

Proof. Although it can be derived from Jeulin [10], we opt to give a direct proof here. To this end, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\Delta\widehat{M}_n^{(b)}\Big|\mathcal{G}_n\Big] &= E\Big[\Delta M_n I_{\{n\le\tau\}} - \frac{1}{Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{n\le\tau\}}E\left[\Delta M_n\widetilde{Z}_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\Big] \\ &= E\left[\Delta M_n\widetilde{Z}_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\frac{1}{Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{n\le\tau\}} - \frac{1}{Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{n\le\tau\}}E\left[\Delta M_n\widetilde{Z}_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the above second equality we use the fact (due to Lemma 2.5-(b)) that

$$E\Big[\Delta M_n\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\Big] = \frac{1}{Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}E\left[\Delta M_n\widetilde{Z}_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right].$$

This ends the proof of theorem. □

In the following proposition, we construct a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale that would serve as the martingale density for a class of $\mathbb{G}$-semi-martingales.

Proposition 3.2. *The following process*

$$\widehat{N}_n^{(b)} := -\sum_{1\le k\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge k\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k>0\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + \sum_{1\le k\le n}\frac{Z_{k-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge k\}} \tag{3.12}$$

is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale such that $1+\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(b)} > 0$ for all $n\ge 1$.

Proof. First, we prove that $\widehat{N}^{(b)}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale. To this end, by using Lemma 2.5-(b), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(b)}\Big|\mathcal{G}_n\right] &= E\left[-\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] + \frac{Z_{n-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_n\right] \\ &= -\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] + E\left[\frac{Z_{n-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_n\right] \\ &= -\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, we check the integrability of $\widehat{N}^{(b)}$. Indeed,

$$E[|\widehat{N}_n^{(b)}|] \le n + \sum_{1\le k\le n}E\left[\frac{Z_{k-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge k\}}\right] = n + \sum_{1\le k\le n}E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k>0\}}\right] \le 2n.$$

Finally, we show that $1+\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(b)} > 0$. Indeed

$$1+\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(b)} = 1 - \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}] + \frac{Z_{n-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}} \ge \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}} + \frac{Z_{n-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}} > 0.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Remark 3.3. *In fact, $\sum_{1\le k\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge k\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k>0\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$ is the $\mathbb{G}$-compensator of the $\mathbb{G}$-adapted increasing process $\sum_{1\le k\le n}Z_{k-1}/\widetilde{Z}_k\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge k\}}$.*

Lemma 3.4. *The stochastic exponential $\mathcal{E}(N)$ of a local martingale N is the form of*

$$\mathcal{E}(N)_n = \prod_{1\le k\le n}(1+\Delta N_k). \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. It is straightforward from the calculation of the stochastic exponential. □

Now, we are ready to state our first main theorem for this section.

Theorem 3.5. *Consider any random time τ and the $\mathbb{F}$-martingale S. Denote the probability measure $\mathbb{Q} \sim \mathbb{P}$ with density $D_n := \mathcal{E}(Y)_n$ where*

$$\Delta Y_n := \widetilde{Z}_n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}>0\}} E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] - Z_{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}},\ Y_0 = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Then the following are equivalent:
(a) *S is an $(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{Q})$-martingale;*
(b) *S is orthogonal to D and Y;*
(c) *$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n S_{n\wedge\tau}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale, where $\widehat{N}^{(b)}$ is given by (3.12).*
As a consequence, all the above three equivalent conditions imply that:
(d) *S^τ satisfies $NA(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{P})$ and $NA(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{Q})$.*

Proof. First, we remark that the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ is well defined and equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$. Indeed, it is easy to check that (Y_n) is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale and

$$1 + \Delta Y_n = \widetilde{Z}_n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}>0\}} E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] + \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}} + (1 - Z_{n-1})\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} > 0,$$

where we used the fact that on the set $\{\widetilde{Z}_n > 0\}$, $1+\Delta Y_n \geq 1$ and the inclusion $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} < 1\}$, since $\{Z_{n-1} = 1\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\}$. Therefore, D is a strictly positive martingale.

The equivalence between (a) and (b) is obvious. In the following, we are focusing on the proof of the equivalence between (a) and (c). Recall that

$$\widehat{N}^{(b)}_n = -\sum_{1\leq k\leq n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}} E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k>0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + \sum_{1\leq k\leq n} \frac{Z_{k-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}}. \tag{3.15}$$

Due to Lemma 2.5, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\frac{\Delta S_k}{\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}\Big] &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}}}{Z_{k-1}} E\Big[\Delta S_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k>0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\Big], \\ E\Big[\Delta S_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}\Big] &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\geq k\}}}{Z_{k-1}} E\Big[\Delta S_k \widetilde{Z}_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

To this end, we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_{n+1} S_{(n+1)\wedge\tau} \Big| \mathcal{G}_{n+1}\right] \\ &= \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n E\Big[(1 + \Delta\widehat{N}^{(b)}_{n+1}) S_{(n+1)\wedge\tau} \Big| \mathcal{G}_n\Big] \\ &= \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n E\Big[S_{n\wedge\tau} + \Delta S_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}} + \Delta\widehat{N}^{(b)}_{n+1} S_{n\wedge\tau} + \Delta S_{n+1}\Delta\widehat{N}^{(b)}_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}} \Big| \mathcal{G}_n\Big] \\ &= \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n \left\{ S_{n\wedge\tau} + E\Big[\Delta S_{n+1}\widetilde{Z}_{n+1} E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=0\}} | \mathcal{F}_n\right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_n\Big] \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}}}{Z_n} \right\} \\ &\quad - \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}} E\Big[\Delta S_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=0\}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_n\Big] \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n S_{n\wedge\tau} + \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n \left\{ E\left[\Delta S_{n+1}\left\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1} E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=0\}} | \mathcal{F}_n\right] - Z_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=0\}}\right\} \Big| \mathcal{F}_n\right]\right\} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}}}{Z_n} \\ &= \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n S_{n\wedge\tau} + \mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_n E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1} \Big| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}}}{Z_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (a) implies (c). Conversely, if (c) holds, we have

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1\leq\tau\}}}{Z_n}=0,\ \text{and}\ \ E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_n>0\}}=0.$$

Notice that

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_n=0\}}=0,\ \text{for all } n\ .$$

Thus, we conclude that $E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]=0$, for all n. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 3.6. *We observe from Theorem 3.5 that even though Y is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale, the stopped process $Y_{n\wedge\tau}=\sum_{k\leq n}\widetilde{Z}_kE\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=0\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{k\leq\tau\}}$ does not satisfy NA($\mathbb{G}$) since it is a $\mathbb{G}$-increasing process. This also sheds some light on the importance of the conditions in Theorem 3.5.*

Remark 3.7. *It is worthy to notice that, in general, for an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, if M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$), we can not conclude M is orthogonal to Y. To wit, let the projection of Y to m as*

$$\Delta Y_n=H_n\Delta m_n+\Delta\overline{m}_n,$$

where $H_n\in\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ and $\overline{m}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale, orthogonal to m. If Y is not null, $\overline{m}$ is not identical zero. By Theorem 3.1, it is easy to see that $\overline{m}^\tau$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale. However, $\overline{m}$ can not be orthogonal to Y unless Y is null.

Corollary 3.8. *Let M be an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale. If for all n,*

$$\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}=\{Z_{n-1}=0\}. \tag{3.17}$$

Then the following properties hold:
(a) *$(M_{n\wedge\tau})_{n\geq1}$ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$);*
(b) *$\left(\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(b)})_nM_{n\wedge\tau}\right)_{n\geq1}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale, where $\widehat{N}^{(b)}$ is given by (3.12) in Proposition 3.2;*
(c) *The probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ given in (3.14) coincides with $\mathbb{P}$, .*
Particularly, the above three properties hold when $Z_n>0$ for all $n\geq0$.

Below, we state our second main theorem of this section, where we give the necessary and sufficient conditions that imposed on the random time τ (or the stopping times in (2.5)) to guarantee the stopped process M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$) for any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M.

Theorem 3.9. *Consider a random time τ and the associated stopping times defined in (2.5). Then the following are equivalent:*
(a) *For any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the stopped process M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$).*
(b) *$\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}=\{Z_{n-1}=0\}$ for all n.*
(c) *$R_1+1=R_2=R_3$.*
(d) *R_3 is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable stopping time.*
(e) *The probability $\mathbb{Q}$, defined via (3.14), coincides with $\mathbb{P}$.*

Proof. The proof of the theorem would be achieved after four steps. In the first step, we prove (b)⇔(c). The second step focuses on (c)⇔(d). The third step deals with (b)⇔(e). In the last step, we prove (a) ⇔ (b).

Step 1: The equivalence between (b) and (c) is obvious. Indeed, if (b) holds, it is trivial that $R_2=R_3$. Conversely, if (c) holds, we derive that

$$E\left(Z_{n-1}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}\right)=E\left(Z_{n-1}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}I_{\{n\geq R_3\}}\right)=E\left(Z_{n-1}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}I_{\{n\geq R_2\}}\right)=0.$$

Hence, we conclude that $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} = 0\}$ for all n.

Step 2: We prove (c)$\Leftrightarrow$(d). If (c) holds, it is easy to see that R_3 is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable stopping time due to $\{R_3 = n\} = \{R_1 = n-1\} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$. Conversely, by the predictability of R_3, we have $0 = E[\widetilde{Z}_{R_3}] = E[Z_{R_3-1}]$; hence $Z_{R_3-1} = 0$ and $R_3 = R_2$.

Step 3: We prove (b)$\Leftrightarrow$(e). If (b) holds, apparently, $Y = 0$ and $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{P}$. Conversely, if (e) holds, $\Delta Y_n = 0$ for all n. Hence, $\widetilde{Z}_n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}>0\}} E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] = Z_{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} = 0$ and $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} = \{Z_{n-1} = 0\}$ for all n.

Step 4: In this step, we focus on the proof of the equivalence between (a) and (b).
(a)$\Rightarrow$(b). Suppose for any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the stopped process M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$). Consider

$$V_n := \mathbb{1}_{\{R_3>n\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{V}_n := \sum_{1\le k\le n} \{E[V_k|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - V_{k-1}\}. \tag{3.18}$$

It is easy to see that $M_n := V_n - \widetilde{V}_n$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale. Therefore $M_{n\wedge\tau} = 1 - \widetilde{V}_{n\wedge\tau}$ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$). Then there exists an equivalent probability $\mathbb{Q}_1 \sim \mathbb{P}$ such that $\widetilde{V}_{n\wedge\tau}$ is a $(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{Q}_1)$-martingale. Therefore $\widetilde{V}_{n\wedge\tau} \equiv 0$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= E\left[\widetilde{V}_{n\wedge\tau}\right] = E\left[\sum_{1\le k\le n} Z_{k-1}\Delta\widetilde{V}_k\right] \\
&= \sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\left(E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{R_3>k\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] - \mathbb{1}_{\{R_3>k-1\}}\right)\right] \\
&= \sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{R_3>k\}}\right] - E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{R_3>k-1\}}\right] \\
&= -\sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{R_3=k\}}\right] = -\sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=0\}}\prod_{1\le i\le k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{i-1}>0\}}\right] \\
&= -\sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{k-1}>0\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=0\}}\prod_{1\le i\le k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{i-1}>0\}}\right] \\
&= -\sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{k-1}>0\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=0\}}\right] = -\sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[Z_{k-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=0\}}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\{Z_k > 0\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_k > 0\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_{k-1} > 0\}$. Therefore, for all n, $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} = 0\}$ and $R_3 \ge R_2$.

(b)$\Rightarrow$(a) It follows immediately from Theorem 3.5 or Corollary 3.8. This ends the proof of the theorem. □

An interesting corollary for two period model is

Corollary 3.10. *Consider a two period model $(\Omega, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0,1,2}, \mathbb{P})$ with an $\mathcal{A}$-measurable positive random time τ. For any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the process M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$) if and only if τ is an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time.*

Proof. If τ is an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time, it is trivial that M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$) for any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M. Conversely, for the random time τ, denote $\Omega_2 := \{\tau = 2\}$, $\Omega_1 := \{\tau = 1\}$ and $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 = \Omega$. By the definitions of Z and $\widetilde{Z}$, we derive that

$$\widetilde{Z}_0 = 1, \widetilde{Z}_1 = 1, \widetilde{Z}_2 = I_{\Omega_2}, \text{ and } Z_0 = 1, Z_1 = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_2|\mathcal{F}_1), Z_2 = 0.$$

If for any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the stopped process M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$), by Theorem 3.9, we know that $\{\widetilde{Z}_2 = 0\} = \Omega_1 = \{Z_1 = 0\} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and τ is an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time. □

3.1 Reverse Problem: before τ

The previous section studied what we can conclude for arbitrage opportunities from the standpoint view of the insider. In this section, we will investigate the equivalence or consequence on the market S if we know that the insider can not make arbitrage opportunities in the market $(\mathbb{G}, S^\tau)$.

We start with two simple lemmas and one proposition before proving Theorem 3.14 below.

Lemma 3.11. *The following hold.*

$$\{n \le \tau\} \ \subset \ \{\widetilde{Z}_n > 0\} \ \subset \ \{Z_{n-1} > 0\} = \ \Gamma(n) := \left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n > 0 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) > 0\right\}. \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove the non-trivial equality $\{Z_{n-1} > 0\} = \Gamma(n)$. Indeed, due to $E\left(P(\widetilde{Z}_n > 0|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})I_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right) = P(\widetilde{Z}_n > 0 = Z_{n-1}) = 0$, we get $\Gamma(n) \subset \{Z_{n-1} > 0\}$. On the other hand, due to $E\left(Z_{n-1}I_{\Gamma(n)^c}\right) = E\left(\widetilde{Z}_n \, I_{\Gamma(n)^c}\right) \le E\left(I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}} \, I_{\Gamma(n)^c}\right) = 0$, we obtain $\{Z_{n-1} > 0\} \subset \Gamma(n)$. This ends the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 3.12. *Let R be an equivalent probability to P. Then the following hold for all n.*

$$\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\} = \{\widetilde{Z}^R_n = 0\}, \quad \textit{and} \quad \{Z_{n-1} = 0\} = \{Z^R_{n-1} = 0\},$$

where $\widetilde{Z}^R_n := R(\tau \ge n|\mathcal{F}_n)$ and $Z^R_{n-1} := R(\tau \ge n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})$.

Proof. Since

$$E\left[\widetilde{Z}_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}^R_n=0\}}\right] = E\left[I_{\{\tau\ge n\}}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}^R_n=0\}}\right] = 0, \text{ and } E\left[Z_{n-1}I_{\{Z^R_{n-1}=0\}}\right] = E\left[I_{\{\tau\ge n\}}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}^R_{n-1}=0\}}\right] = 0,$$

we obtain $\{\widetilde{Z}^R_n = 0\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_n = 0\}$ and $\{Z^R_{n-1} = 0\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} = 0\}$. The symmetric roles of R and P complete the proof of the lemma. □

Proposition 3.13. *Let X be an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale. Then the following are equivalent.*
(a) *For all n, we have*

$$E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

(b) *X^τ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale under the probability $\mathbb{Q} := \prod_{n=1}^N q_n$, where*

$$q_n := \left(\frac{Z_{n-1}}{\widetilde{Z}_n} I_{\{n\le\tau\}} + I_{\{n>\tau\}}\right)\left(P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n > 0|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n\le\tau\}} + I_{\{n>\tau\}}\right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. First, we remark that the probability $\mathbb{Q}$ is well defined since $P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n > 0|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}+I_{\{n>\tau\}} > 0$ due to Lemma 3.11. To complete the proof, we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n > 0|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n\leq\tau\}} + I_{\{n>\tau\}}\right) E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right)\\ &= E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n\leq\tau\}} = -E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}.\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of the proposition. □

Throughout the rest, we consider the following notation.

$$\mathbb{Q}^{(e)} := \prod_{n=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\widetilde{Z}_n}{Z_{n-1}} I_{\{Z_{n-1}>0\}} + I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0<Z_{n-1}\}} + I_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right)\left(1+E\left(I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0<Z_{n-1}\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\right)^{-1}\cdot\mathbb{P}\sim\mathbb{P}.$$

Below, we state the main theorem in this subsection which shows what we can conclude if the market $(\mathbb{G}, X^\tau)$ excludes arbitrage opportunities for any $\mathbb{F}$-adapted integrable process X.

Theorem 3.14. *Let τ be a random time and X be an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted integrable process. Then the following are equivalent.*
(a) *X^τ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{P})$.*
(b) *$X^{(e)}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$, where $\Delta X_n^{(e)} := \Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}$.*

Proof. (a)$\Longrightarrow$(b). If X^τ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{G})$, there exists a probability $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{G}} := \prod_{n=1}^{N}(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}})\cdot\mathbb{P}\sim\mathbb{P}$ such that X^τ is a $(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{G}})$-martingale, where $1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}>0$ and $E\left(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right)=1$, for all n. By Jeulin [10], there exists two $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable random variables $Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}$ and ϕ_n such that

$$\left(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}\right) I_{\{n\leq\tau\}} = Y_n^{\mathbb{F}} I_{\{n\leq\tau\}} + \phi_n I_{\{n=\tau\}}. \tag{3.21}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\{n\leq\tau\}} &= E\left(\left(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}\right) I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right) = E\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}} I_{\{n\leq\tau\}} + \phi_n I_{\{n=\tau\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right)\\ &= \frac{I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}}{Z_{n-1}} E\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}\widetilde{Z}_n + \phi_n\Delta D_n^{o,\mathbb{F}}\ \Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\\ &= \frac{I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}}{Z_{n-1}} E\left(\widetilde{Z}_n\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}} + \frac{\phi_n\Delta D_n^{o,\mathbb{F}}}{\widetilde{Z}_n} I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\right)\ \Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta D_n^{o,\mathbb{F}} = \widetilde{Z}_n - Z_n$ and $\Delta D_n^{o,\mathbb{F}} I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} = (\widetilde{Z}_n - Z_n) I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}} = 0$. Hence, we get

$$E\left(\frac{\widetilde{Z}_n I_{\{Z_{n-1}>0\}}}{Z_{n-1}}\ \widetilde{Y}_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}\ \Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) = I_{\{Z_{n-1}>0\}},\ \text{and}$$

$$\widetilde{Y}_n := Y_n^{\mathbb{F}} + \frac{\phi_n\Delta D_n^{o,\mathbb{F}}}{\widetilde{Z}_n} > 0, \quad \text{on the set}\ \ \{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}.$$

Define L by

$$L_k := \prod_{n=1}^{k}\left(\widetilde{Y}_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}} + I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0<Z_{n-1}\}} + I_{\{Z_{n-1}=0\}}\right) > 0.$$

It is easy to check that L is an $(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{Q}^{(e)})$-martingale, i.e. $E^{Q^{(e)}}\left(\frac{L_n}{L_{n-1}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=1$ for all $1\leq n\leq N$. Since X^τ is a $(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{G}})$-martingale, due to (3.21), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}+\phi_n I_{\{n=\tau\}}\right)\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right)\\ &= E\left(\Delta X_n\left(\widetilde{Z}_nY_n^{\mathbb{F}}+\phi_n\Delta D_n^{o,\mathbb{F}}\right)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\frac{I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}}{Z_{n-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by taking conditional expectation under $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ in the above equality and using the fact $\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}\subset\{Z_{n-1}>0\}$, we get

$$E\left(\Delta X_n\frac{\widetilde{Z}_nI_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}}{Z_{n-1}}\widetilde{Y}_n\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0. \tag{3.22}$$

Then, we deduce

$$\left(1+E\left(I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0<Z_{n-1}\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\right)E^{Q^{(e)}}\left(\Delta X^{(e)}\frac{L_n}{L_{n-1}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=E\left(\Delta X_n\frac{\widetilde{Z}_nI_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n>0\}}}{Z_{n-1}}\widetilde{Y}_n\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0.$$

Therefore, $LX^{(e)}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale under $\mathbb{Q}^{(e)}$ and $X^{(e)}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{F},Q^{(e)})$ and NA$(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$.

(b)$\Longrightarrow$(a). Since $X^{(e)}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$, there exists a probability $\mathbb{R}$ equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$ such that $X^{(e)}$ is an $(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{R})$-martingale. By Lemma 3.12, the condition (3.20) in Proposition 3.13 is trivial satisfied by $X^{(e)}$ under the probability $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. $E^{\mathbb{R}}\left(\Delta X_n^{(e)}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathbb{R}}=0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=E^{\mathbb{R}}\left(\Delta X_n^{(e)}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.13, we conclude that $\left(X^{(e)}\right)^\tau=X^\tau$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{P})$.
This ends the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 3.15. *The related work in Aksamit et al. [1] and Choulli et al. [5] proved similar and other much deeper results in continuous time semi-martingale settings by using optional stochastic integral and predictable characteristics. Let us point out that the $\mathbb{G}$-martingale $N^{\mathbb{G}}$ in Proposition 3.2 could be also written as a discrete time version of optional stochastic integral.*

4 Non-arbitrage on $]\!]\tau,+\infty[\![$

In this section, we shall move to the stability of non-arbitrage after an honest time τ. We recall its definition below.

Definitions 4.1. *A random time τ is honest, if for any n, there exists an $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable r.v. τ_n such that $\tau\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}=\tau_n\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}$.*

For more details on honest times, we consult Jeulin [10] and Barlow [4]. For an honest time τ, we associate the following stopping times

$$\sigma_1:=\inf\{n\geq1:Z_n<1\},\quad \sigma_2:=\inf\{n\geq1:Z_{n-1}<1\}\ \text{ and }\ \sigma_3:=\inf\{n\geq1:\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}. \tag{4.23}$$

Lemma 4.2. *For an honest time τ and stopping times in (4.23), the following hold for all $1\leq n\leq N$.*
(a) $\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}\subset\{Z_{n-1}<1\}$ *and* $\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}\subset\{Z_n<1\}$.
(b) σ_2 *is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable stopping time and $\sigma_2\leq\sigma_3$ and $\sigma_1\leq\sigma_3$.*
(c) $\tau\geq\sigma_1$ *and $Z_{n-1},\widetilde{Z}_n<1$ on $\{\tau<n\}$.*

Proof. (a) Notice that

$$E\left[\left(1-\widetilde{Z}_n\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right]=E\left[(1-Z_{n-1})\,\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right]=0. \tag{4.24}$$

Hence, $\{Z_{n-1}=1\}\subset\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}$. Due to $Z_n\leq\widetilde{Z}_n$, we have $\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}\subset\{Z_n<1\}$.

(b) Since $\{\sigma_2\leq n\}=\{Z_{n-1}<1\}\in\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$, we conclude that σ_2 is predictable. The inequalities $\sigma_2\leq\sigma_3$ and $\sigma_1\leq\sigma_3$ follow immediately from (a).

(c) Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}E\left[\ \mathbb{I}_{\{n>\tau\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right] &= E\left[(1-Z_{n-1})\mathbb{I}_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right]=0,\ \text{and}\\ E\left[\ \mathbb{I}_{\{n>\tau\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}\right] &= E\left[(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)\mathbb{I}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}\right]=0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Z_{n-1}<1$ and $\widetilde{Z}_n<1$ on the set $\{n>\tau\}$. This ends the proof of the lemma. □

The following lemma describes the connection between conditional expectations under $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{G}$. For its proof, we consult Jeulin [10].

Lemma 4.3. *Let Y be an integrable $\mathbb{A}$-measurable random variable. Then, the following hold.*
(a) *On the set $\{n>\tau\}$, the conditional expectation under $\mathcal{G}_n$ is given by*

$$E\left[Y|\mathcal{G}_n\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}=E\left[Y\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\frac{1}{1-\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}. \tag{4.25}$$

(b) *On the set $\{n>\tau\}$, the conditional expectation under $\mathcal{G}_{n-1}$ is given by*

$$E\left[Y|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}=E\left[Y\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\frac{1}{1-Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}. \tag{4.26}$$

Moreover, if Y is $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable, we have

$$E\left[Y|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}} = E\left[Y(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\frac{1}{1-Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}. \tag{4.27}$$

The following theorem characterizes the relationship between $\mathbb{F}$-martingales and $\mathbb{G}$-martingales on the stochastic interval $]\!]\tau,+\infty[\![$. For the continuous time settings, we consult Jeulin [10].

Theorem 4.4. *Let M be an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale and τ be an honest time. Then the following process*

$$\widehat{M}_n^{(a)}:=M_{n\vee\tau}-M_\tau-\sum_{1\leq k\leq n}\frac{1}{1-Z_{k-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}E\left[\Delta M_k(1-\widetilde{Z}_k)|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right],$$

is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale.

Proof. Although it can be derived from Jeulin [10], we opt to give a direct proof here. To this end, by using Lemma 4.3-(b), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}E\Big[\Delta\widehat{M}_n^{(a)}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\Big] &= E\Big[\Delta M_n\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}-\frac{1}{1-Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}E\left[\Delta M_n(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\Big]\\ &= E\Big[\Delta M_n\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\Big]-\frac{1}{1-Z_{n-1}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}E\left[\Delta M_n(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of theorem. □

The following proposition is constructing a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale density for a class of $\mathbb{G}$-semi-martingales.

Proposition 4.5. *The following process*

$$\widehat{N}_n^{(a)} := -\sum_{1\le k\le n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}} E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + \sum_{1\le k\le n} \frac{1-Z_{k-1}}{1-\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}} \tag{4.28}$$

is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale such that $1+\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(a)} > 0$.

Proof. First, we prove that $\widehat{N}^{(a)}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale. To this end, by using Lemma 4.3-(b), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(a)}|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right] &= -\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}] + E\left[\frac{1-Z_{n-1}}{1-\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right] \\ &= -\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}] + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that $1+\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(a)} > 0$. Indeed

$$1+\Delta\widehat{N}_n^{(a)} = 1-\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}}E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}] + \frac{1-Z_{n-1}}{1-\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}} \ge \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\ge n\}} + \frac{1-Z_{n-1}}{1-\widetilde{Z}_n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<n\}} > 0.$$

The integrability of $\widehat{N}^{(a)}$ follows from the fact that $E\left|\widehat{N}_n^{(a)}\right| \le 2n$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Below, we state the first main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.6. *Consider an honest time τ and an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale S. Denote the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}^{(a)} \sim \mathbb{P}$ with density $D_n^{(a)} := \mathcal{E}(Y^{(a)})_n$ where*

$$\Delta Y_n^{(a)} := (1-\widetilde{Z}_n)\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}<1\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] - (1-Z_{n-1})\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}},\ Y_0^{(a)} = 0. \tag{4.29}$$

Then the following are equivalent:
(a) *S is a $(\mathbb{Q}^{(a)},\mathbb{F})$-martingale;*
(b) *S is orthogonal to $D^{(a)}$ and $Y^{(a)}$;*
(c) *$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n(S_n - S_{n\wedge\tau})$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale, where $\widehat{N}^{(a)}$ is given by (4.28).*
As a consequence, all the above three equivalent conditions imply
(d) *$S - S^\tau$ satisfies $NA(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{P})$ and $NA(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{Q}^{(a)})$.*

Proof. First, we remark that $Y^{(a)}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale and $1+\Delta Y^{(a)} > 0$. Indeed,

$$1+\Delta Y_n^{(a)} = (1-\widetilde{Z}_n)\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}<1\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] + \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}} + Z_{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}} > 0,$$

where we used the fact that on the set $\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}$, $1+\Delta Y_n^{(a)} \ge 1$ and the inclusion $\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\} \subset \{Z_{n-1}>0\}$, since $\{Z_{n-1}=0\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_n=0\}$. Therefore, $D^{(a)}$ is a strictly positive martingale.
The equivalence between (a) and (b) is obvious. In the following, we are trying to prove the equivalence between (a) and (c). Recall that

$$\widehat{N}_n^{(a)} = -\sum_{1\le k\le n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}} E[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + \sum_{1\le k\le n} \frac{1-Z_{k-1}}{1-\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}. \tag{4.30}$$

Due to Lemma 2.5 , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\frac{\Delta S_k}{1-\widetilde{Z}_k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\Big] &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}}{1-Z_{k-1}}E\Big[\Delta S_k\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k<1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\Big], \\ E\Big[\Delta S_k\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\Big] &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}}{1-Z_{k-1}}E\Big[\Delta S_k(1-\widetilde{Z}_k)|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $S_{n+1}-S_{(n+1)\wedge\tau}=S_n-S_{n\wedge\tau}+\Delta S_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_{n+1}S_{(n+1)\wedge\tau}|\mathcal{G}_{n+1}\right] \\ &=\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_nE\Big[(1+\Delta\widehat{N}^{(a)}_{n+1})S_{(n+1)\wedge\tau}|\mathcal{G}_n\Big] \\ &=\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_nE\Big[S_n-S_{n\wedge\tau}+\Delta S_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}+\Delta S_{n+1}\Delta\widehat{N}^{\mathbb{G}}_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}|\mathcal{G}_n\Big] \\ &=\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n\left\{S_n-S_{n\wedge\tau}+E\Big[\Delta S_{n+1}(1-\widetilde{Z}_{n+1})E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]|\mathcal{F}_n\Big]\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}}{1-Z_n}\right\} \\ &-\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n\left\{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}E\Big[\Delta S_{n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_n\Big]\right\} \\ &=\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n\left(S_n-S_{n\wedge\tau}\right) \\ &+\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n\left\{E\left[\Delta S_{n+1}\left\{(1-\widetilde{Z}_{n+1})E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]-(1-Z_n)\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n+1}=1\}}\right\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\right\}\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}}{1-Z_n} \\ &=\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n(S_n-S_{n\wedge\tau})+\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_nE^{\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}}{1-Z_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (a) implies (c). Conversely, if (c) holds, we have

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{n+1>\tau\}}}{1-Z_n}=0, \text{ and } E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_n<1\}}=0.$$

Notice that

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_n=1\}}=0, \text{ for all } n\ .$$

Thus, we conclude that $E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}}\left[\Delta S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]=0$, for all n. This ends the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 4.7. *We observe from Theorem 4.6 that even though $Y^{(a)}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale, the process $Y^{(a)}_n-Y^{(a)}_{n\wedge\tau}=\sum_{k\le n}(1-\widetilde{Z}_k)E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_k\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{k>\tau\}}$ fails NA($\mathbb{G}$) since it is a $\mathbb{G}$-increasing process.*

Corollary 4.8. *For any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, if for all n*

$$\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}=\{Z_{n-1}=1\}. \tag{4.31}$$

Then the following properties hold:
(a) *The process $M_n-M_{n\wedge\tau}$ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$);*
(b) $\Big(\mathcal{E}(\widehat{N}^{(a)})_n\left(M_n-M_{n\wedge\tau}\right)\Big)_{n\ge1}$ *is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale, where $\widehat{N}^{(a)}$ is given by (4.28) in Proposition 4.5;*
(c) *The probability measure $\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}$, given in (4.29), coincides with $\mathbb{P}$.*

Below, we state our second main theorem in this section, where we give the necessary and sufficient conditions that imposed on the random time τ (or the stopping times in (4.23)) to guarantee the process $M-M^\tau$ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$) for any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M.

Theorem 4.9. *Consider an honest time τ and the associated stopping times defined in (4.23). Then the following are equivalent:*
(a) *For any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the process $M_n - M_{n\wedge\tau}$ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$).*
(b) $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\} = \{Z_{n-1} = 1\}$ *for all n.*
(c) $\sigma_1 + 1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$.
(d) σ_3 *is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable stopping time.*
(e) *The probability $\mathbb{Q}^{(a)}$, defined via (4.29), coincides with $\mathbb{P}$.*

Proof. The proof of the theorem would be achieved after four steps. In the first step, we prove (b)⇔(c). The second step focuses on (b)⇔(d). The third step deals with (b)⇔(e). In the last step, we prove (a) ⇔ (b).

Step 1: The equivalence between (b) and (c) is obvious. Indeed, if (b) holds, it is trivial that $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3$. Conversely, if (c) holds, we derive that

$$E\left((1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}\right) = E\left((1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}I_{\{n<\sigma_3\}}\right) = E\left((1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}I_{\{n<\sigma_2\}}\right) = 0.$$

Hence, we conclude that $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} = 1\}$ for all n.

Step 2: We prove (b)⇔(d). If (b) holds, it is easy to see that σ_3 is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable stopping time. Conversely, due to the predictability of σ_3 and

$$E\left[(1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}\right] = E\left[(1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\{n<\sigma_3\}}\right] = E\left[(1 - \widetilde{Z}_n)I_{\{n<\sigma_3\}}\right] = 0,$$

we conclude that $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} = 1\}$ for all n.

Step 3: We prove (b)⇔(e). If (b) holds, apparently, $Y^{(a)} = 0$ and $\mathbb{Q}^{(a)} = \mathbb{P}$. Conversely, if (e) holds, $\Delta Y_n^{(a)} = 0$ for all n. Hence, $(1 - \widetilde{Z}_n)\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{n-1}<1\}}E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] = (1 - Z_{n-1})\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}} = 0$ and $\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\} = \{Z_{n-1} = 1\}$ for all n.

Step 4: We prove (a)⇔(b). Suppose for any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the stopped process M^τ satisfies NA($\mathbb{G}$). Consider the $\mathbb{F}$-martingale

$$M_n := \sum_{1\le k\le n}\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=1\}} - E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right]\right).$$

It is easy to see that $M_n - M_{n\wedge\tau} = -\sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}$. Note that $M_n - M_{n\wedge\tau}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$ predictable decreasing process satisfying NA($\mathbb{G}$). Therefore it is null. Then, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= E\left[M_n - M_{n\wedge\tau}\right] = \sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[E\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=1\}}|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<k\}}\right] \\ &= \sum_{1\le k\le n} E\left[(1 - Z_{k-1})\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{Z}_k=1\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\{\widetilde{Z}_k = 1\} \subset \{Z_{k-1} = 1\}$ for all k.
The reverse implication follows immediately from Theorem 4.6 or Corollary 4.8. This ends the proof of the theorem. □

4.1 Reverse Problem: after τ

The previous section studied what we can conclude for arbitrage opportunities from the standpoint view of the insider. In this section, we will investigate the equivalence or consequence on the market S if we know that the insider can not make arbitrage in the market $(\mathbb{G}, S - S^\tau)$.

We start with two simple lemmas and one proposition before proving Theorem 4.13 below.

Lemma 4.10. *The following hold.*

$$\{n > \tau\} \ \subset \ \{\widetilde{Z}_n < 1\} \ \subset \ \{Z_{n-1} < 1\} = \left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) > 0\right\}. \tag{4.32}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove the non-trivial equality $\{Z_{n-1} < 1\} = \left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) > 0\right\}$. Indeed, due to $E\left(P(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})I_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right) = P(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1 = Z_{n-1}) = 0$, we get $\left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) > 0\right\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} < 1\}$. On the other hand, due to

$$\begin{aligned} E\left((1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n<1|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0\right\}}\right) &= E\left((1 - \widetilde{Z}_n)I_{\left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n<1|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0\right\}}\right) \\ &\leq E\left(I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}\ I_{\left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n<1|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0\right\}}\right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain $\{Z_{n-1} < 1\} \subset \left\{P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) > 0\right\}$. This ends the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 4.11. *Let R be an equivalent probability to P. Then the following hold for all n.*

$$\{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\} = \{\widetilde{Z}_n^R = 1\}, \quad \textit{and} \quad \{Z_{n-1} = 1\} = \{Z_{n-1}^R = 1\},$$

where $\widetilde{Z}_n^R := R(\tau \geq n|\mathcal{F}_n)$ and $Z_{n-1}^R := R(\tau \geq n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})$.

Proof. Since

$$E\left[(1 - \widetilde{Z}_n)I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n^R=1\}}\right] = E\left[I_{\{\tau<n\}}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n^R=1\}}\right] = 0, \text{ and } E\left[(1 - Z_{n-1})I_{\{Z_{n-1}^R=1\}}\right] = E\left[I_{\{\tau<n\}}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_{n-1}^R=1\}}\right] = 0,$$

we obtain $\{\widetilde{Z}_n^R = 1\} \subset \{\widetilde{Z}_n = 1\}$ and $\{Z_{n-1}^R = 1\} \subset \{Z_{n-1} = 1\}$. The symmetric roles of R and P complete the proof of the lemma. □

Proposition 4.12. *Let X be an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale. Then the following are equivalent.*
(a) *For all n, we have*

$$E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) = 0. \tag{4.33}$$

(b) *$X - X^\tau$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale under the probability $\mathbb{Q} := \prod_{n=1}^N q_n^{(a)}$, where*

$$q_n^{(a)} := \left(\frac{1 - Z_{n-1}}{1 - \widetilde{Z}_n} I_{\{n>\tau\}} + I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}\right)\left(P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n>\tau\}} + I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}\right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. First, due to Lemma 4.10, we remark that the probability $\mathbb{Q}$ is well defined. To complete the proof, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(P\left(\widetilde{Z}_n < 1|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n>\tau\}} + I_{\{n\leq\tau\}}\right) E^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{n>\tau\}} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right) \\ &= E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n>\tau\}} = -E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) I_{\{n>\tau\}}. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of the proposition. □

Throughout the rest, we consider the following notations.

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{(e)} := \prod_{n=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1-\widetilde{Z}_n}{1-Z_{n-1}}I_{\{Z_{n-1}<1\}}+I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1>Z_{n-1}\}}+I_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right)\left(1+E\left(I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1>Z_{n-1}\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\right)^{-1}\cdot\mathbb{P}\sim\mathbb{P}.$$

Below, we state the main theorem in this subsection which shows what we can conclude if the market $(\mathbb{G}, X-X^\tau)$ excludes arbitrage opportunities for any $\mathbb{F}$-adapted integrable process X.

Theorem 4.13. *Let τ be an $\mathbb{F}$-honest time and X be an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted integrable process. Then the following are equivalent.*
(a) *$X-X^\tau$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{P})$.*
(b) *$\widetilde{X}^{(e)}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$, where $\Delta\widetilde{X}^{(e)}_n := \Delta X_n I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}$.*

Proof. (a)$\Longrightarrow$(b). If $X-X^\tau$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{G})$, there exists a probability $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{G}} := \prod_{n=1}^{N}(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}})\cdot\mathbb{P}\sim\mathbb{P}$ such that $X-X^\tau$ is a $(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{G}})$-martingale, where $1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}>0$ and $E\left(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right)=1$, for all n. By Proposition (5.3) in Jeulin [10], there exists an $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable $Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}$ such that

$$\left(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}\right)I_{\{n>\tau\}} = Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}I_{\{n>\tau\}}. \tag{4.34}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\{n>\tau\}} &= E\left(\left(1+\Delta K_n^{\mathbb{G}}\right)I_{\{n>\tau\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right) = E\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}I_{\{n>\tau\}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right)\\ &= \frac{I_{\{n>\tau\}}}{1-Z_{n-1}}E\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)\,\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get

$$E\left(\frac{(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)I_{\{Z_{n-1}<1\}}}{1-Z_{n-1}}\,Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}\,\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right) = I_{\{Z_{n-1}<1\}}.$$

Define L by

$$L_k := \prod_{n=1}^{k}\left(Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}+I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1>Z_{n-1}\}}+I_{\{Z_{n-1}=1\}}\right)>0.$$

It is easy to check that L is an $(\mathbb{F},\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{(e)})$-martingale, i.e. $E^{\widetilde{Q}^{(e)}}\left(\frac{L_n}{L_{n-1}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=1$ for all $1\le n\le N$. Since $X-X^\tau$ is a $(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{G}})$-martingale, due to (4.34), we deduce that

$$0 = E\left(\Delta X_n I_{\{n>\tau\}}Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}\Big|\mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right) = E\left(\Delta X_n(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}\,\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\frac{I_{\{n>\tau\}}}{1-Z_{n-1}}.$$

Hence, by taking conditional expectation under $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ in the above equality and using the fact $\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}\subset\{Z_{n-1}<1\}$, we get

$$E\left(\Delta X_n\frac{(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}}{1-Z_{n-1}}Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}\,\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0. \tag{4.35}$$

Then, we deduce

$$\left(1+E\left(I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1>Z_{n-1}\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\right)E^{\widetilde{Q}^{(e)}}\left(\Delta\widetilde{X}^{(e)}\frac{L_n}{L_{n-1}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=E\left(\Delta X_n\frac{(1-\widetilde{Z}_n)I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n<1\}}}{1-Z_{n-1}}Y_n^{\mathbb{F}}\ \Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0.$$

Therefore, $L\widetilde{X}^{(e)}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale under $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{(e)}$ and $\widetilde{X}^{(e)}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{F},\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{(e)})$ and NA$(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$.

(b)$\Longrightarrow$(a). Since $\widetilde{X}^{(e)}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$, there exists a probability $\mathbb{R}$ equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$ such that $\widetilde{X}^{(e)}$ is an $(\mathbb{F},\mathbb{R})$-martingale. By Lemma 4.11, the condition (4.33) in Proposition 4.12 is trivial satisfied by $\widetilde{X}^{(e)}$ under the probability $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. $E^{\mathbb{R}}\left(\Delta\widetilde{X}_n^{(e)}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathbb{R}}=1\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=E^{\mathbb{R}}\left(\Delta\widetilde{X}_n^{(e)}I_{\{\widetilde{Z}_n=1\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0$. Therefore, by Proposition 4.12, we conclude that $\widetilde{X}^{(e)}-\left(\widetilde{X}^{(e)}\right)^{\tau}=X-X^{\tau}$ satisfies NA$(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{P})$. This ends the proof of the theorem. □

5 Explicit Examples

In this section, we revisit those two examples presented in Introduction and calculate explicitly the Azéma supermartingales and the arbitrage opportunities. For more examples, we refer to Aksamit et al. [2] and Fontana et al. [9] for continuous time settings.

Example 1.2 (continued). We are now in the same settings as Example 1.2.

Lemma 5.1. *The following hold.*
(a) *The progressive enlargement filtration* $\mathbb{G}=(\mathcal{G}_n)_{0\le n\le 2}$ *is given by*

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\emptyset,\Omega\},\ \mathcal{G}_1=\{\emptyset,\Omega,\{\omega_1,\omega_2\},\{\omega_3\},\{\omega_4\}\},\quad \text{and}\quad \mathcal{G}_2=\sigma(\{\emptyset,\Omega,\{\omega_1\},\{\omega_2\},\{\omega_3\},\{\omega_4\}\}).$$

(b) $\mathcal{G}_{\tau-}=\mathcal{G}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{G}_\tau=\mathcal{G}_{\tau+}=\mathcal{G}_2$.

Proof. (a) is trivial by the definition of $\mathbb{G}$. Notice that $\mathcal{G}_{\tau-}=\mathcal{G}_0\vee\sigma\{A\cap\{n<\tau\},\ \ A\in\mathcal{G}_n,\ n=1,2\}=\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_\tau=\sigma\{A,\ \ A\cap\{\tau\le n\}\in\mathcal{G}_n,\ \ n=0,1,2\}=\mathcal{G}_2$. Then (b) follows. □

Lemma 5.2. *For the above settings, the following properties hold.*
(a) *The processes* A,m,Z *and* $\widetilde{Z}$ *are given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 &= 0,\ A_1=p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}},\ A_2=p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}+\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}.\\
m_0 &= 1,\ m_1=1,\ m_2=p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}+\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}.\\
Z_0 &= 1,\ Z_1=1-p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}},\ Z_2=0.\\
\widetilde{Z}_0 &= 1,\ \widetilde{Z}_1=1,\ \widetilde{Z}_2=\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) $\widetilde{Z}_\tau=1,\ \tau=\sup\{n\ge 0:\ \widetilde{Z}_n=1\}$, *and* τ *is an honest time.*
(c) *The stopping times in (2.5) are given by*

$$R_1=2,\ R_2=+\infty,\ R_3(\omega_3)=2,\ R_3(\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4)=+\infty.$$

(d) *The stopping times in (4.23) are given by*

$$\sigma_1(\omega_1,\omega_2)=2,\sigma_1(\omega_3,\omega_4)=1,\sigma_2(\omega_1,\omega_2)=+\infty,\sigma_2(\omega_3,\omega_4)=2,\sigma_3(\omega_3)=2,\ \sigma_3(\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4)=+\infty.$$

Proof. By the definitions of Z and $\widetilde{Z}$ in (2.4), we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0 &= P(\tau>0)=1,\ Z_1=P(\tau>1|\mathcal{F}_1)=\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2\}}+\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}(1-p),\ Z_2=0\\ \widetilde{Z}_0 &= P(\tau\geq 0)=1,\ \widetilde{Z}_1=P(\tau\geq 1|\mathcal{F}_1)=1,\ \widetilde{Z}_2=P(\tau\geq 2|\mathcal{F}_2)=\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}. \end{aligned}$$

The calculation for A and m is analogical. The assertions (b), (c) and (d) are straightforward to check. We omit it here. □

Theorem 5.3. *Under the current settings, the following properties hold:*
(a) *In the market S^τ, both public traders with information $\mathbb{F}$ and insiders with information $\mathbb{G}$ can make arbitrage.*
(b) *In the market S, only insiders with information $\mathbb{G}$ can make arbitrage.*
(c) *The conditions (3.17) and (4.31) failed. Indeed*

$$\{\Delta S_2\neq 0\}\cap\{\widetilde{Z}_2=0\}\cap\{Z_1>0\}=\{\omega_3\},\ \textit{and}\ \{\Delta S_2\neq 0\}\cap\{\widetilde{Z}_2=1\}\cap\{Z_1<1\}=\{\omega_4\}. \quad (5.36)$$

Proof. In the market S^τ, apparently, by taking $H_1=0,\ H_2(\{\omega_1,\omega_2\})=0,\ H_2(\{\omega_3,\omega_4\})=-1$, public traders and insiders can make an arbitrage. While in the market S, by taking $H_1^{\mathbb{G}}=0,\ H_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_1,\omega_2\})=0,\ H_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_3\})=1, H_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_4\})=-1$, only insider traders can make an arbitrage since the strategies $(H_n^{\mathbb{G}})_{1\leq n\leq 2}$ are only $\mathbb{G}$-predictable. The condition (5.36) is straightforward to verify. □

Lemma 5.4. *For any $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M, the following process $M^{\mathbb{G}}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale.*

$$M_0^{\mathbb{G}}=M_0,\ M_1^{\mathbb{G}}=M_1,\ M_2^{\mathbb{G}}=M_2-p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_4\}}\left(\Delta M_2(\omega_4)-\Delta M_2(\omega_3)\right)+(1-p)\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}}\left(\Delta M_2(\omega_4)-\Delta M_2(\omega_3)\right).$$

Proof. Notice that $\Delta m_1=0$ and $\Delta m_2=p\mathbb{I}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}-\mathbb{I}_{\{\omega_3\}}$. We calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Z_1}\mathbb{1}_{\{2=\tau\}}E\left[\Delta M_2\Delta m_2\mid\mathcal{F}_1\right] &= \frac{1}{1-p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}E\left[\Delta M_2\left(p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}-\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}}\right)\mid\mathcal{F}_1\right]\\ &= \frac{1}{1-p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_4\}}E\left[\Delta M_2\left(p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}-\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}}\right)\mid\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}\right]\\ &= p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_4\}}\left(\Delta M_2(\omega_4)-\Delta M_2(\omega_3)\right),\\ \frac{1}{1-Z_1}\mathbb{1}_{\{1=\tau\}}E\left[\Delta M_2\Delta m_2\mid\mathcal{F}_1\right] &= p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}}E\left[\Delta M_2\left(p\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}}-\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}}\right)\mid\mathcal{F}_1\right]\\ &= (1-p)\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}}\left(\Delta M_2(\omega_4)-\Delta M_2(\omega_3)\right). \end{aligned}$$

The combination of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.4 completes the proof of the lemma. □

Corollary 5.5. *The following process $S^{\mathbb{G}}$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale:*

$$\begin{aligned} S_0^{\mathbb{G}} &= S_0,\ S_1^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_1,\omega_2\})=uS_0,\quad S_1^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_3,\omega_4\})=dS_0,\\ S_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_1\}) &= u^2S_0,\ S_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_2\})=udS_0,\ S_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_3\})=dS_0, S_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_4\})=dS_0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the Lemma 5.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_3\}) &= S_2(\{\omega_3\})+(1-p)(d^2-ud)S_0=dS_0,\\ S_2^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\omega_4\}) &= S_2(\{\omega_4\})-p(d^2-ud)S_0=dS_0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the equality $pu+(1-p)d=1$. □

Example 1.3 (continued). We are now in the same setting as Example 1.3. Recall the random time

$$\tau_1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{on } \{\omega_3\} \\ 2, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{5.37}$$

The progressive enlargement filtration $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_n)_{0\le n\le 2}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\},\ \mathcal{G}_1 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}, \{\omega_3\}, \{\omega_4\}\}, \text{and } \mathcal{G}_2 = \sigma(\{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1\}, \{\omega_2\}, \{\omega_3\}, \{\omega_4\}\}).$$

Lemma 5.6. *For the above settings, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= 0,\ A_1 = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}},\ A_2 = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}. \\ m_0 &= 1,\ m_1 = 1,\ m_2 = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}. \\ Z_0 &= 1,\ Z_1 = 1 - \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3,\omega_4\}},\ Z_2 = 0. \\ \widetilde{Z}_0 &= 1,\ \widetilde{Z}_1 = 1,\ \widetilde{Z}_2 = \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_4\}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\tau_1} = 1, \quad \textit{and } \tau_1 \textit{ is an honest time.}$$

Proof. The calculations follow the same schedule as that of Lemma 5.2. □

Theorem 5.7. *The process S stays as a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale. Therefore there is no arbitrage opportunity in the market S^{τ_1} and $S - S^{\tau_1}$; meanwhile*

$$\{\Delta S_2 \neq 0\} \cap \{\widetilde{Z}_2 = 0\} \cap \{Z_1 > 0\} = \emptyset, \textit{ and } \{\Delta S_2 \neq 0\} \cap \{\widetilde{Z}_2 = 1\} \cap \{Z_1 < 1\} = \emptyset. \tag{5.38}$$

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$E\left[\Delta S_2 \Delta m_2 \mid \mathcal{F}_1\right] = E\left[\Delta S_2 \left((\lambda - 1)\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_3\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_4\}}\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_1\right] = 0,$$

where we used the fact that $\Delta S_2 \equiv 0$ on $\{\omega_3, \omega_4\}$. Therefore the process S stays as a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale and there is no arbitrage. □

Acknowledgements: The research of Tahir Choulli and Jun Deng is supported financially by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, through Grant G121210818.

References

[1] Aksamit A., Choulli T., Deng J. and Jeanblanc M.: Non-arbitrage up to Random Horizon for Semimartingale Models, http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.1142, 2013.

[2] Aksamit, A., Choulli, T., Deng, J., and Jeanblanc, M.: Arbitrages in a progressive enlargement setting , To appear in World Scientic Review: Proceeding for "Workshop on Stochastic Portfolio, Arbitrage Credit and Informational Risks", China, 2014.

[3] Acciaio, B., Fontana, C., Kardaras, C.: Arbitrage of the first kind and filtration enlargements in semimartingale financial models, http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.7198, 2014

[4] Barlow M. T.: Study of a filtration expanded to include an honest time, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw, Gebiete, 44, 307-323, 1978.

[5] Choulli, T., Aksamit, A., Deng, J., and Jeanblanc, M.: Non-Arbitrage under a Class of Honest Times, http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.0410, 2014

[6] Dalang, R.C., Morton A., and Willinger W.: Equivalent martingale measures and no-arbitrage in stochastic securities market models. Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes 29.2, 185-201, 1990.

[7] Coculescu, D., Jeanblanc, M., and Nikeghbali, A.: Default times, no-arbitrage conditions and changes of probability measures. Finance and Stochastics, 16(3), 513-535, 2012.

[8] Dellacherie, C. and Meyer, P-A.: Probabilités et Potentiel, chapitres V-VIII",Hermann, Paris, 1980.

[9] Fontana, C. and Jeanblanc, M. and Song, S.: On arbitrages arising with honest times. To appear in Finance and Stochastics, 2013.

[10] Jeulin, T.: Semi-martingales et Grossissement d'une Filtration, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 833, Springer, Berlin - Heidelberg - New York, 1980.

[11] Jacod, J.: Calcul stochastique et problemes de martingales, Vol. 714, Springer, 1979.

[12] Rogers, L. C. G.: Equivalent martingale measures and no-arbitrage. Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes 51.1-2, 41-49, 1994.

[13] Schachermayer, W.: A Hilbert space proof of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing in finite discrete time. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 11.4, 249-257, 1992.

[14] Song, S.Q.: No-arbitrage condition for $S^{\tau-}$ in a progressively enlarged filtration, http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.4474, 2014.

[15] He, S.W., Wang, C.K., and Yan J.A.: Semimartingale theory and stochastic calculus, Taylor & Francis US, 1992.